



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ilar treatment by this author of the institutional developments of the decade. As already indicated, the volume covers not simply the military history and the incidental relations to foreign powers, but also the first steps in the formation of new state governments. Upon this topic the material is presented in more readily available and in more logical form than elsewhere. The author recognizes the political importance of the state organizations of the time, and this may in some measure explain his views upon the character of the national government. There is also a suggestive chapter upon the relations between the Whigs and Tories, and a sketch also of "The New West" which supplements the similar chapter in the preceding volume.

Without attempting, as indeed would be out of place, a minute criticism of details upon which the judgment of the author has doubtless been controlled by the exigencies of the series, it may simply be remarked that the two volumes illustrate a high standard of "serial" historical work, bringing as they do to the reader who may be only partially familiar with the groundwork an intelligible and attractive statement of important phases in national development, and giving also to the student of the period an instructive and refreshing review of materials, most of which, to be sure, are commonplace. Each of the volumes is supplemented, as usual, with a critical estimate of the literature of its subject.

H. A. C.

*The Writings of Samuel Adams.* Collected and edited by HARRY ALONZO CUSHING. Volume II., 1770-1773. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1906. Pp. x, 454.)

THIS volume of the writings of the "great incendiary" covers a period of deep interest and importance, during which he was in a large degree responsible for keeping alive the flame of discontent. His persistent and untiring attention to the grievances of the hour, and the aid received from the tactless obduracy of Hutchinson seem to the reader to have been the chiefest cause for the continuance of ill-feeling. As to this, however, it is difficult to speak with assurance, for it is hard to say what were the discontents of the common people and of the artisans and watermen of Boston with whom Adams had so much influence. Beginning just before the massacre, the volume ends with the prolonged discussion over the power of Parliament between Hutchinson and the Representatives, a discussion in which Hutchinson's arguments were so strong and ill-timed that they were successful in practically committing the American party to the denial of all power in Parliament. Much of the space is taken up with a consideration of the massacre and the evidence of the soldiers' guilt. Here we find not only a revelation of Adams's bitter hostility to the soldiery and to Hutchinson, but interesting evidence of the dangerous irritation caused by the presence of the troops. Many of the letters and public papers deal also with the right

of the governor under instruction to call the General Court in session at Cambridge, an act which, producing no good for the British cause, gave ample opportunity for denouncing a violation of the charter and for insisting on the limits of the prerogative. Naturally much is also said of the governor's receiving his salary from England; and the keenness with which the logical consequences of this practice are pointed out discloses the power that Adams had in handling a popular question, when with all the appearance of practicality he held continually before the eyes of the people principles of liberty and theories of sound government. The shrewdest of practical politicians, he juggled adroitly with principles and ideals; therein lay the strength of the Revolutionary movement. It must be said that a perusal of these letters impresses one anew with the man's ability and strengthens one's admiration for his ingenuity; but they awaken no chord of sympathy for the man himself. Sympathy is aroused for misguided Hutchinson, a man of dignity and rectitude of purpose, who must have been peculiarly destitute of those qualities, unadmirable though some of them may be, which were giving Adams success and bringing on the Revolution. The qualities in Adams which Hutchinson thought demagogic he himself woefully lacked.

With a few exceptions the letters are of consuming interest; the unities are well observed—one place, a limited time, one body of actors, and one great central question. In fact if we omit the letters about the troops and the massacre, which are in parts wearisome, the rest of the volume deals with one side of the duel between Adams and Hutchinson, between the arch democrat and the reserved man "born and educated among us", who had nothing but contempt for the excesses of the mob at a Boston town-meeting—the duel between the man who stood for liberty and who, without profound book-learning or much outlook on the world, yet saw face to face the fundamental principles of American political life, and on the other hand the man of affairs, the historian, the able administrator, who indeed saw more clearly than the men of England but was out of sympathy with the dominating impulses of his native country.

That Adams had made up his mind in favor of independence and was all through these years pressing on toward that goal nowhere appears in these volumes. Naturally he would not declare such a hope in broad daylight, nor perhaps even in the twilight of the newspaper controversy in which he is continually appearing as "A Chatterer" or "Vindex" or "Candidus"; but if he had this notion anywhere near so firmly rooted in his mind as we have been told, would not sly hints have been thrown out to Arthur Lee or to some other of his congenial correspondents? We find bitterness enough and much plain-speaking in these letters but no hints at the necessity of independence. He appears first to have given something like open utterance to this desire in 1773.

There is no space here to point out the development of Adams's argument and the shifting of his methods to suit the occasion. The difficulty of tracing their development is much increased by the doubt

of the authorship of some of the papers. Did he, for example, write the striking letter to Shelburne (I. 152-162) and other letters of the notable series of 1768, or were they, as John Adams asserted, in considerable measure written by Otis (*The Works of John Adams*, ed. C. F. Adams, 1850-1856, X. 367)? It is a striking fact that some of the most noteworthy arguments appear through these years only in papers prepared by committees on which Otis served. There is, therefore, at least some internal evidence that Otis prepared the papers and gave them, as he is reported to have said, to Sam Adams, "to *quieu whew* them". And there can be no doubt that the Clerk of the House, with the pen of a ready writer, which was always prepared to "quieu whew" whatever maintained the rights of the colonists, was not allowed to frame without guidance the papers that are here given as his handiwork. I do not mean by this to criticize the appearance of the papers in this volume, but only to point out that Adams's own intellectual course cannot with unwavering assurance be followed in detail through these papers. Toward the end of the volume are given the replies of the House to the governor on the question of Parliamentary power, the papers above referred to in which Hutchinson in full legal panopoly goes forth to meet that champion of popular rights as if he expected to face only a shepherd youth with a sling and pebbles from the brook. The replies were probably written with the pen of Sam Adams; but how much of the real argument he furnished it is hard to say. In some measure they owed their force to the learning of John Adams, from whom of course came the use of the famous Calvin case which he uses so forcibly in his own argument. We may well expect to see in the next volume Sam Adams standing on what, according to Hutchinson, he called "better ground"—better than mere historical statement and technical reasoning —on the ground that "all men have a *natural* right to change a bad constitution."

In one respect this volume is superior to the first. It indicates with care the reason for attributing newspaper letters and other papers to Adams. Little more if anything can be demanded. The notes are numerous and helpful. Possibly it might be well to give in foot-notes occasional excerpts from Hutchinson's letters or from the writings in the press to which Adams replied with a caustic bitterness that makes one wonder whether Hutchinson were not right in saying that to Adams's characteristic signature of "Vindex" ought to be added "Malignus and Invidus", to make his names a little more significant. And yet probably the editor, who has unquestionably shown skill in the preparation of this volume, has been checked by limits of space and other restrictions.

A. C. McLAUGHLIN.